

Original Paper

Proxy Wars and the Dilemma of Global Peace: Interrogating the Roles of the Super Powers (1946-1991)

Ebie Sunday Onyekwuma¹

¹ Department of Political Science and Public Administration, University of Delta, Agbor, Delta State, Nigeria

Received: October 30, 2022 Accepted: November 22, 2022 Online Published: December 12, 2022

doi:10.22158/eprd.v3n2p1

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/eprd.v3n2p1>

Abstract

The end of the Second World War brought about the emergence of two super powers, the United States and the Soviet Union that assumed major key players in global Politics. The two superpowers adopted expansionist policies in their attempt to build alliances so as to implement and protect their diverse ideological interests. In the process, proxy wars ensued in different part of the globe. Adopting secondary source of data and Content Analysis as well as Power Theory, the paper examined the roles of the super powers in proxy wars and the consequences on global peace. The paper discovered that the Super-powers dominated the global political system through proxy wars such as the Vietnam War, Korean War and the Cuba Missile Crisis among others. The paper further noted the consequences of proxy war on global peace to include arms proliferations and the development of nuclear weapons, high human fatalities and destruction of major cities and the rise in global terrorist groups and attacks. The paper made recommendations among others that global ideological rigidity should be softened to accommodate varieties and the United Nations should give more attention to the situation in Korea Peninsula to prevent the repeat of the 1950s.

Keywords

Proxy War, Super Powers, Global Peace

1. Introduction

Proxy war has assumed an important dimension in contemporary global discourse with regard to its consequences on global peace. Not much was known about proxy war until the emergence of the two superpowers orchestrated by the destruction of Western Europe at the end of the Second World War. Proxy war became escalated during the cold war era due to the division of the World into two antagonistic ideological blocs-the Capitalist and the Communist under the leadership of the United States and the defunct Soviet Union respectively. The United States and the defunct Soviet Union acting as the super powers and with the support of their allies adopted expansionist policies in Asia and the Middle East; building more alliances, supporting and aiding parties in disputes and in some occasion, getting directly involved in warfare as it happened in Vietnam, Korea and Afghan wars. The US and the defunct Soviet Union expressed their angers toward each other through their proxies but avoided direct confrontation to prevent escalation of the war which would have resulted to Third World War as countries of the world were ideologically sensitive and attached to any of the two dominant ideologies, the Capitalist and the Communist. Even the so-called Non-Allied countries of the Third World were perfectly not neutral in the Cold War era. In the words of Wilde Robert, during the Cold War, proxy warfare was motivated by fears that a conventional war between the United States and the Soviet Union would result in nuclear holocaust which rendered the use of ideological proxies a safer way of exercising hostilities (Wilde, 2015).

The dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 represented the collapsed of Communism with the United States left as the sole super power existing within the period thereby de-escalating global political tension temporarily with relative absence of balance of power competition (Beinart, 2008). However, it was later noticed that many transformations took place globally leading to the emergence of some countries that assumed power based in terms of economy and high investment in military infrastructure. This led to controversy among scholars that the United State should not be seen as the sole power since China, Russia, Japan, the European Union, and India have potential to change the international system. However, the collapsed of the Soviet Union actually changed the global power equation but the phenomenon of proxy war outlived the Cold War era, with more great powers engaging in conflicts outside their territories through support and assistance to parties involve. In the midst of these proxy wars is the question of global peace that seems to be affected. The trajectory of war of any type constitutes a threat to human life and societies and the destructive tendencies are sometimes unimaginable. Arising from the above, this paper is poised to x-ray some of these proxy wars that took place between 1946 and 1991 to find out the levels of involvement of the Superpowers and to examine the consequences on global peace. These positions have posed the following perturbing questions that needed to be answered: What are the proxy wars between 1946 and 1991. What roles did the Superpowers played in these wars and what are the reasons for their involvement in wars outside their territories? What are the consequences of these proxy wars on global peace? These are some of the questions that this paper attempts to answer.

2. Theoretical Framework

This work adopted Power Theory propounded by Hans Morgenthau, E.H Car, R, Niebuhr, George Kennan and Henry Kissinger. Power Theory belongs to the realist school that places emphasis on power and national interest rather than ideals. Schwarzenegger (1967) defined power as the ability of an actor (in the international scene) to use tangible and intangible resources and assets in such a way as to influence the outcome of international events to its own satisfaction. The analysis of power as a prime factor in international relations justifies the application of Power Theory in explaining the phenomenon of proxy wars and the reasons the super powers are involved in wars and conflicts outside their territories.

3. Conceptual Framework

3.1 Proxy War

Literatures on the concept of Proxy Wars from different perspective abound and their focus is on what constitute a proxy war and how it should be identified. Just like every other concept in the social sciences, identifying proxy war is faced with controversies from scholars of war and strategic studies on how it should be situated. The study of the nature of wars and how they are executed shows that some times, countries of great powers exhibit their grievances against one another through their allies in conflict situations to avoid direct confrontation. In defining proxy war, some scholars interpret it from state centric approach and only succeeded in internationalizing the conflict without recognizing the activities of the regional or local groups or parties that started the conflict in the first place. The political scientist, Karl Deutsch explained proxy war as an international conflict between two foreign powers fought out on the soil of third country; and using some of that country's manpower, resources and territory as a means of achieving preponderantly foreign goals and foreign strategies. In this definition, the roles of non-state actors neither are nor recognized and so, regional power's struggle are not considered as important. It should also be noted that the super powers only come in when there is conflict whether instigated or not, the regional powers or parties must commence the conflict. Osmańczyk, Jan Edmund defines proxy war as an armed conflict between two states and non-state actors, one or both of which act at the instigation or on behalf of other parties that are not directly involved in the hostilities (Osmańczyk, 2002). This definition recognized the roles of the state actors and non-state actors in conflict that can be classified as proxy war. Hence, Hughes (2014) argues that in order for a conflict to be considered a proxy war, there must be a direct, long-term relationship between external actors and the belligerents involved. The external actors render assistance in providing military training, arms, logistic supply, funding, and or any other forms of material attentions which assist a belligerent party in sustaining its war effort. The relationship must be seen to be substantial to the benefit of the parties involved to be able to defend their stance in the conflict situation. Proxy war encompasses a breadth of armed confrontation and its core definition hinges on two separate powers utilizing external strife to somehow attack the interests or territorial holding of the other.

Minter (2008) called proxy war “The Contra warfare” after the Nicaraguan experience. He noted that there was dominance of Super powers pattern of behaviour in the provision of military aid and advisors in support of local political entrepreneur. To buttress Minter’s argument, Safire’s political Dictionary (2008) defines proxy war as the great powers hostility expressed through client states. The Superpowers expressed their hostility in a third party country; and this could explain the reasons most conflicts in less developed countries are frequent and severe. The Super powers use them as an avenue to showcase their power, possibly to sell their weapons of war, to test the efficacies of these newly manufactured weapons of war and to promote their political ideologies in global politics.

Proxy Wars started at the end of the World War II when the United States understood the activities of the defunct Soviet Union to dominate East Europe. The United States reacted by switching its policies of pacification to that of confrontation against what it saw as communist expansionism. The US came up with the Truman doctrine which was the policy of containment against the Soviet Union. According to Akpotor (2011), the policy was primarily military and its main objective was to contain or stop further Russian expansionism beyond the Western European countries. He went further to say that for the US to achieve this objective; it formed several military alliances with Europeans (NATO), Asians (SEATO) and the Middle East (CENTRO) as defense mechanism against the Russians.

3.2 Global Peace

Literally, global peace means absent of war in a global environment. Meanwhile, an analysis of the concept of global peace shows that it is more than absence of war but a non violence situation that goes with happiness, freedom and peace among people and nations in the global environment. This idea of non violence world is one motivation for people to willingly cooperate either voluntary or by virtue of a system of government that prevent warfare. Galtung (1990) has argued that war is only one form of violence that is open, physical and direct, and that there are other types of social conditions which though are not perceived as war, but countries or societies experiencing them cannot be said to be peaceful. For instance, countries experiencing high level of poverty, exclusion, intimidation, oppression, fear and other psychological pressures cannot be classified as peaceful. Global peace does not mean absence of rivalry but it represents global conflict resolution dependent on non-violence approaches to prevent war. Emphasis is on how to eradicate war through peaceful resolution of conflicts.

According to David Mitrany (1888-1977), the prevention of war required the creation of peace system. Arguing from the perspective of Mitrany, there must be an institutionalized peace system to prevent war. It is only when this system is effectively utilised to prevent war and nations embrace peace that the concept of global peace can be meaningful. Robert (1988) opined that a peace system involves multiple war prevention layers. According to him, the first is global reforms which reduces the causes of war, involves non threatening defense policies as well as political, economic, ecological and cultural change. The second layer is conflict resolution mechanism on the local, regional, national and global levels. Douglas (2013) noted that the creation of a global peace system involves synergistic elements such as a transformative vision that a peace based global setting is possible, the understanding of

interdependence and cooperation, an added level of social identity including all human beings, the creation of effective and democratic procedure of international adjudication and peace supporting symbols and values.

A research on the effect of mediation carried out by World Peace Group where a small group of mediators who applied what is known as “Collective Consciousness” that creates influence by the phenomenon known as the Super Radiance Effect recommended seven principles that define world peace. These principles are:

- Immediate cessation of violent conflicts: The prime principle of world peace is the immediate cessation of open warfare. The report stated that if they can achieve a global Super Radiance Group with 8,400 TM-Sid meditating together in one place then they will eliminate conflict in places like Afghanistan, Syria and Mali within a day.
- Rapid evaporation of terrorist activity: Once a global coherence group is established, the modern plague of malevolent terrorism will find no fertile soil in which to breed. The reason for this is that a more coherent collective consciousness creates more coherent thought throughout the population. Tolerance of other people’s ideas and a growing empathy between cultures and peoples will also grow.
- Softening of ideological conflict: Enlivenment of the world will increase peoples’ realisation that we are all one family. People everywhere will see that our differences are superficial. Variety adds richness to life not strife. Unnatural, negative ideologies will lose their grip on the impressionable. There will be a growing reconciliation of seeming opposites which will stimulate greater harmony and tolerance between religions and political principles.
- Lessening of the dangerous super power rivalry between USA, Russia, Europe and China: As with past world peace projects, the super power rivals will be less fearful of one another’s ambitions and will increasingly realise that the world is big enough for us all. World leaders will be able to accommodate their diverging national interests without fearing to look weak at home.
- Growing friendliness between the nations: There will be a growing realisation among all governments that they have a lot more to gain by mutual collaboration with other nations. Instead of adopting narrow definitions of self-interest that create win-lose situations, friendliness at governmental level will enable the pursuit of win-win solutions.
- Spontaneous growth in economic activity and international trade and commerce: The relaxation of fear, the reduction in international conflict and the enlivenment of the collective consciousness will stimulate creative activity, a surge in technical and economic innovation and enable a wave of new growth in trade and commerce. This help in the case of the surge in economic prosperity in Norway and New Zealand
- At national level, there will be a reduction in antisocial behaviour: We will all start to benefit from the reduction in the local trends of violent crime, sickness, unemployment, welfare dependency,

financial problems, and a number of other negative aspects of national life (World Peace Group Report 2015).

3.3 The Super Powers

The United States of America and the defunct Soviet Union were the two super powers that emerged after the Second World War. Though, the term “Super Power” was first used in 1944 during the Second World War to refer to the United States, United Kingdom and the Soviet Union (Hall, 1944); but with the fall of the United Kingdom at the end of War, the United States and the defunct Soviet Union assumed the only super powers. Miller (2008) sees a super power as a country that has the capacity of proper dominating power and influence anywhere in the world and sometimes, in more than one region of the globe at a time and so may plausibly attain the status of a global hegemony. Miller went further to talk about how to measure the basic components of Superpower status along five axes of power which are military, economic, political and cultural otherwise regarded as soft power. Dukes (1997) states that, a Super power must be able to conduct a global strategy including the possibility of destroying the world; to command vast economic potentials and influence and to present a universal ideology.

A Super power must be able to project its power, soft and hard globally. Bremmer (2015) opined that a super power is a country that can exert enough military, political and economic power to persuade nations in every region of the world to take important actions they will not otherwise take. Super power was used to identify a new category of powers able to occupy the highest status in the world in which, as the war then raging demonstrated, status could challenge and fight each other on a global scale; three Super Power nations existed before the end of the Second World War which were the United Kingdom (regarded as the first Super power with widest domination and control over 25% of the world population and land areas); the United States and the Soviet Union (Fux 1944). The US and USSR later grew in power before and during the Second World War and the Cold War. Fux explanation shows that the first Super Power was the Great Britain that enjoyed wider coverage than the United States and the USSR before the Second World War and thereafter. Immediately after the War and the Suez crisis in 1956, the United Kingdom’s status as a Super Power was greatly demolished, leaving only the United States and Soviet Union as Super Powers dominating world affairs (Bremmer 2015). The Soviet Union promoted communism, planned economy and a one-party state, while the United States promoted liberal democracy and the free market. This was reflected in the Warsaw Pact and NATO military alliances respectively as most of European countries aligned with either the United States or the Soviet Union. These alliances implied that these two nations assumed the key players in an emerged bipolar world, in contrast with a previously multi polar world. The United States became the only super power after the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1990s. Then, the term hyper power began to be applied to the United States, as the sole Superpower of the post Cold War era (International Herald Tribune, 1999).

The realities of Superpowers in post-Cold War era has been called to question by scholars who argue that today's complex global marketplace and the rising interdependency between the world's nations have made the concept of a Superpower an idea of the past and that the world is now multi polar. However, while the military dominance of the United States remains unquestioned for now and its international influence has made it an eminent world power, countries such as China, India, Brazil and Russia are inventing new ways to counter US military supremacy and are making great strides in science, literature, soft power, and diplomacy (Von Drehle, 2006; Liu, 2003).

4. Super Powers and the Proxy Wars

4.1 List of Proxy Wars (1946-1991)

CONFLICTS	DATE
<u>Greek Civil War</u>	(1946-1949)
<u>First Indochina War</u>	(1946-1954)
<u>Malayan Emergency</u>	1948-1960
<u>Arab-Israeli Conflict</u>	1948
<u>Korean War</u>	1950-1953
<u>Suez Crisis</u>	1956-1957
<u>Laotian Civil War</u>	1953-1975
<u>Vietnam War</u>	1957-1975
<u>Guatemalan Civil War</u>	1960-1996
<u>Congo Crisis</u>	1960-1965
<u>Bay of Pigs Invasion</u>	1961
<u>Cuban Missile Crisis</u>	1962
Nigerian Civil War	1967-1970
Indo-Pakistani War of	1971
Angolan Civil War	1974-2002
<u>Libyan-Egyptian War</u>	1977
<u>Ogaden War</u>	1977-1978
<u>Afghan-Soviet War</u>	1979-1989
<u>Nicaraguan Civil War</u>	1979-1990

SOURCE: Military Wiki-Fandom.

4.2 *The Roles of the Super Powers in Some Proxy Wars*

- 1) **The Greek Civil War:** The communist waged war against the Greek government to adopt communist ideology. Akpotor (2004) stated that the Greek communist were waging a guerilla war and the US official feared that a communist victory in Greece would destabilize Europe. After consulting with congressional leaders, President Truman of the United States approved the sum of 400,000,000 US dollars as aid to Turkey and Greece against the action of the communist USSR backed by Albans, Yugoslavs and Bulgaria. Greek civil war became the first post Second World War proxy war.
- 2) **The Korean War:** The Korean war of 1950s witnessed a tense confrontation between the Super Powers through their proxies. The invasion of South Korea by North Korea was highly opposed by the United States. While the South Korea was an ally of the United States with Capitalist ideology, North Korea belonged to the Communist world with total support from the defunct Soviet Union. Acting with the approval of the United Nations, the United States came to the aid of the South Korea and at the point when the North Korea was almost defeated by the alliances of South Korea and the United States, the Communist China with the support of USSR intervened on the part of North Korea in November 1950 and the American soldiers and their South Korea counterpart were forced to retreat (United States Department of States, 2015).
- 3) **The Vietnam Civil War:** In the Vietnam War, the superpowers had a field day fighting proxy war that caused monumental damages to the locals. The damages were as a result of the long duration the war lasted. According to Akpotor (2011), the United States initially became involved in 1956 when the Truman administration responded to the Communist victory in China by agreeing to pay part of the lost of French rule in Vietnam. He explained further that when Vietnamese communist troops forced France to withdraw from Vietnam in 1954, the country split into two. The United States threw its support behind the non-communist south while the Soviet Union and China came to the aid of North Vietnam. The Communist forces ended the war by seizing control of South Vietnam in 1975 and the U.S. policy in Vietnam became very unpopular even within the Americans. In reaction, President Johnson of the United State came up with the policy of Vietnamization in contrast to the Americanization policy and signed a Paris Peace Accord in 1973 that pulled the United States out of the War (Kolko, 1985).
- 4) **Middle East Crises:** Middle East has been a region where the two Super Powers exhibited their power struggle in international politics. The United State and defunct Soviet Union, later Russia were involved in Saudi Arabia and Iran war, Israel and Palestine war and recently in Syria war with severe devastating effect in the region. In 1967 Arab Israel war, Israel was supported by the United States against the Arab Nations supported by the Soviet Union. From 1963, the United States relationship with Egypt began to sour because of the

fear that Nasser Socialist policies were in favour of the Socialist Soviet Union agenda. To balance the power of the Soviet Union in the Middle East, United States decided to improve its relationship with Israel. This was done through granting of aids to Israel to purchase arms. According to Kathrine Arnold, under the Nixon administration, military aid to Israel grew from \$30 million into an astonishing \$2.5 billion between 1970 and 1974 (Arnold, 2019).

- 5) **The Cuban Missile Crisis:** The Caribbean crisis as it is sometime calls was a 35 days missile scare confrontation between the two known superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union in the cold war era. Ultimately, the Cuba missile crisis was recorded as the closest attempt made by the super powers to use nuclear weapon in international conflict. The application of pretence by the super powers in proxy engagement gave way to direct deployment of missiles in close contact countries with the aim of conducting direct strikes on the opponent's territory. The United States of America deployed missiles in Italy and Turkey while the Soviet Union retaliated by deploying similar ballistic missile in Cuba. Scott & Hughes (2015) reveals that the confrontation between the super powers in the Cuba Missile Crises was the closest the Cold War trajectory got escalated toward full blown nuclear war. Though the crisis lasted within a very short period but the level of tension generated globally regarding the use of weapon of mass destruction remains unprecedented in global conflict analysis; and the increased acquisitions of other weapons of war defines the centre piece of the Cold War era in world history.

4.3 Reasons for Proxy Wars

One reason for the emergence of proxy war on the global stage is the conscious and covert decisions by the Superpowers to avoid a direct military confrontation that may replicate the era of the Second World War. The assumption is that when there is direct outbreak of hostility between the Superpowers, the rate of destruction may be too monumental, particularly with the weapon of mass destruction in their possession. Super powers abstain from direct military confrontation because of the uncertainty of the security outcomes in this era of Mutually Assured Destruction (Robert 2015). The fears that direct conflict between the United States and Soviet Union would result in nuclear holocaust during the cold war era rendered proxy wars a safer way of exercising hostilities (Robert, 2015).

Secondly, Proxy war is cost effective and safer for the superpowers to execute. Nations may be motivated to engage in proxy warfare due to financial concerns; supporting irregular troops, insurgents, non-state actors or less advanced ally's militaries can be significantly cheaper than deploying national armed forces. More so, the proxies usually bear the brunt of casualties and economic damage resulting from prolonged conflicts (SATP 2015). Master and Zachary (2015) explained that during its later years, the USSR often found it less expensive to arm or otherwise prop-up NATO-antagonistic parties in lieu of direct engagement. The proliferation of televised media and its impact on public perception made the US public susceptible to war-weariness and skeptical of risking American life abroad. The

Superpowers' ulterior motive in proxy war is to protect their economy and the life of their people by waging wars against each other outside their territories thereby shifting damages to the proxy allies that are mostly less developed countries that become the Superpowers' field of play with serious damages to their economies so as to keep them as subordinate in global politics.

Thirdly, it is very difficult for liberal democracies to engage directly in a war with any country without seeking the consent and support of the people. Even when it is imperative but the majority of the people disapproved of it, the government is bound by that decision therefore making proxy engagement a window for such government. According to Mumford (2013), Government of some nations, particularly liberal democracies may chose to engage in proxy warfare despite military superiority, when majority of their citizens are opposed to entering a conventional war. He stated further that the US adopted this strategy in Vietnam as a result of the so called Vietnam syndrome of extreme war weariness among the American population.

Fourthly, approaching war through proxy helps the Superpowers to avoid potential negative international reactions from allied nations and other international partners and Intergovernmental Organizations. The method is to avoid illegality when there is a standing peace treaty, acts of allegiance or other international agreements ostensibly forbidding direct warfare.

Finally, proxy war becomes more prominent when there is security dilemma. If a country is threatened by the conduct of a rival country in a third party country, the former may strengthened its position to prevent the later from having upper hand through support and assistance. The essence is to prevent the later from having a total grip of the third party country. Robert (2015) argues that, if one or both rivals come to believe that their favoured faction is at disadvantage, they will often respond by escalating military and or financial support. This explains the action of the USA and USSR in the Korean War during the cold war era.

5. The Consequences of Proxy Wars on Global Peace

5.1 Increases in Global Terrorist Groups and Attacks

The United States Department of Defence (2000), defines terrorism as the calculated use of unlawful violence or threat of unlawful violence to inculcate fear; intended to coerce or to intimidate government or societies in the pursuit of goals that are generally political, religions, or ideological. The increase in the numbers of Islamic terrorist groups and attacks in the World could be associated with the destabilizing effect of proxy wars in the Middle East. The Israel Palestine conflict presents a situation where the weaker side, the Palestinians adopts terrorism as a means to draw international attention to their plight. The Palestinians applies terrorist attacks in their struggle when they discovered that they could not face the Israelis in conventional warfare. The argument is that, "one man's terrorism is another man's freedom". Furthermore, the defeat of the Arab Nations by Israel backed by the United States in 1967's six days war generated terrorist activities across the world. Osama bin Laden in his speech after the September 11 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States stated as follows:

The expansion of Israelis one of the greatest crimes, and you are the leaders of its criminals. And of course there is no need to explain and prove the degree of American support for Israel. The creation of Israelis a crime which must be erased. Each and every person whose hands have become polluted in the contribution towards this crime must pay its price, and pay for it heavily (The Guardian, 2002).

Furthermore, the Super Powers' interference in the domestic affairs of weak states is identified to be part of the generating forces of terrorist groups and subsequent terrorist attacks across the world. Put differently, a party in conflict could take to terrorism when it feels threatened by the nature of support and assistance given to its opponent by external powers. In Iraq, the United States overthrew the government of Saddam Hassan and enthroned its loyalist in power, providing assistance and backing. The Taliban could not challenge the installed pro-American Iraqis government directly through conventional means; the group took to terrorism to express their rejection of the United State interference. Eze (2015) argues that, directly or indirectly, International terrorism is the cumulative effect or by-product of the adverse imperialistic decisions, actions, inactions, practices and injustices of the US and her allies against weaker States and non State actors.

5.2 Arm Proliferation and the Development of Nuclear Weapons

According to Scott & Hughes (2015), the Cuba Missile Crisis remains the defining moment in national security and nuclear war preparation. As at 1962, the United State was considered to have about 26,400 stockpiles of nuclear weapons and the Soviet Union had 3,300 in preparation for arm confrontation again each other over crisis in Cuba. The United States deployed about 4375 nuclear weapon particularly nuclear artillery with about 450 of them for ballistic missiles, cruise missiles and aircraft in Europe and the Soviet Union had more than 550 similar weapons in preparation for the conflict (Norris, 2012).

The Korea war represents the first time jet aircraft played central role in air combat involving new generation of faster, jet powered fighters in the theatre of war recorded in world history (Allison, 2012). That was a landmark contribution to global arm race and the development of military infrastructure which some national leaders deploy presently in crises situations that poses threat to global peace. Though, the Korea war ended in 1953 with the signing of Korea Armistice Agreement, the North and South Korea remain engaged in frozen conflict as a result of the military presence of the United States in the peninsular which explains North Korea's heavy investment in the development of missile programme with nuclear war head. The US has maintained its presence in that region since the 1950s, protecting its allies, the South Korea and Japan. The United States and South Korea have been carrying out joint military exercise along South Korea border with North Korea. This action has provoked North Korea who feels threatened by their show of force. In response, the North Korea decided to develop nuclear war head to deter the US from interfering on issues in Korea peninsula. The development of intercontinental ballistic missile was to prove to the US that North Korea can hit part of its territories if provoked. According to North Korea's Vice Foreign Minister, "we have got powerful nuclear

deterrents already in our hands and we certainly will not keep our arms crossed in the face of a US pre-emptive strike". In addition, North Korea's deputy ambassador to the United Nations, Choe Myong-nam explained that the hostile activities on the part of the United States and South Korea made North Korea to strengthen its national defence capability as well as pre-emptive strike capabilities with nuclear forces as a centre piece (Aljezeera news, 20 Feb. 2018).

5.3 Destructions of Lives and Properties

In Vietnam War, the near total destruction of the infrastructure explained the devastating effects of proxy wars. The bombing campaign in the "operation rolling thunder" destroyed significant amount of infrastructure, making life more difficult for North Vietnamese. Unexploded bombs dropped during the campaign have killed tens of thousands since the war ended, not only in Vietnam, but also in Cambodia and Laos (A & E Television Networks, LLC; n.d. web. 2015). According to Birtle (2000), the Korea War was recorded as one of the most destructive conflicts in modern time considering the level of human fatalities especially civilian death and the monumental damages to the infrastructures and the general economy. Over 3 million deaths through mass killing were recorded and the North Korea remains one of the most heavily bombed countries in war history as at 1991.

In Greek civil war, an estimated number of 158,000 people were recorded killed (Hondrox, 1983); while about 1,000,000 people temporally relocated (Jones, 1089). Record shows that in the Arab-Israel conflict of 1948, Israel lost an estimated 6373 people (4000 fighters and 2400 civilians) and the Arab lost about 3700-7000 lives (Collins & Lapierre, 1973). The Palestinian Arabs had human fatalities estimated of 3000-13000 fighters and civilians (El-Nawawy, 2002). Many were displaced in various proxy wars theatres that took place between 1946 and 1991 leading to forceful migrations and refugee escalations with heavy consequences on the security and the economy of the receiving states.

6. Conclusion

The paper examined the phenomenon of proxy wars and the roles of the Super Powers using the Greek Civil War, the Korean War, the Vietnam War, the Middle East crisis and the Cuba Missile Crisis as cases for analysis. The paper also made analysis of the consequences of proxy wars that took place between 1946 and 1991 on global peace. The work discovered that the emergence of the United States and the defunct Soviet Union as the super powers at the end of the Second World War ushered in the era of proxy wars across the globe. The paper further revealed that the increase in the number of proxy wars was orchestrated by the two Superpowers' quest for power and influence in global environment leading to the development of alliances and military capabilities.

An analysis of the roles of the superpowers in some proxy wars was carried out and it was revealed that the super powers were highly involved in these conflicts for reasons that were mostly national interest self protection and national prestige. Unfortunately, the actions and activities of the super powers in proxy wars have severe consequences on global peace. It was further ascertained that the consequences includes the increase in global terrorist attacks, Arm race(Armament) of the cold war era, global high

human fatalities and monumental destruction of infrastructures and the economy particularly of the Third World countries among others.

Base on the above findings, the paper makes the following recommendations:

- 1) Great powers should avoid assisting parties in conflicts instead; they should take to mediations, peace keeping and peace building in managing conflicts in any part of the world. Military support to parties in conflicts should be de-emphasized and effort should be made to embrace political solution to world issues including conflict. Studies show that in the present global military order, total peace from victory in conflict of international dimension looks unachievable so, every conflict should be resolved on the table to give parties the opportunity to discuss their differences. It should be noted that countries may win wars but lose the peace.
- 2) Ideological rigidity should be softened to accommodate varieties. The World Peace Group Report shows that “variety adds riches to life”. There should be greater harmony and tolerance in global politics. Instead of adopting narrow definitions of self-interest that create win-lose situations, friendliness at governmental level will enable the pursuit of win-win solutions. The acquisition of weapon of mass destruction by great countries is a threat to global peace as no country appears safe in the present global security order. It is therefore irrational to maintain ideological rigidity in the present global order and expect peace and harmony among nations especially the great nations that seems not ready to give in.
- 3) The sovereignty of every nation should be respected by countries of great powers to avoid violent resistance that may lead to arm conflicts or wars. The Russia Ukraine war would have been avoided if Russia did not undermined the sovereign status of Ukraine.
- 4) The United Nations should give more attention to the situation in Korea peninsula to prevent the repeat of the incident of the 1950s. The United State should review its defence strategy in the Korea peninsula to de-escalate tension and allow the North and South Korea to sort out their difference in a round table discussion to be supervised by the United Nations. External interferences and supports should be stopped to allow amicable resolution of the conflict to encourage relative peace the in peninsula.
- 5) The acquisition of nuclear weapon by some countries potent danger to global peace especially when it is found in wrong hands. The UN should come up with a strong resolution on nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction as humanity cannot continue to live in fears of its usage. Much has been said about the threat by Russia to use nuclear weapon in Russia Ukraine war; that was not reasonable and comfortable for the world. If nuclear weapon must exist or be acquired, let it be found in countries of great minds, development and where rationality is highly considered. It should be a country that is controlled by a system not an individual so as to prevent abuse.

- 6) Finally, the great powers should avoid conducting hostility in less developed countries of the world to prevent more damage to their economies. The major challenge of the Third World countries is poverty which has affected the security situation and, any attempt to create more poverty through great power proxy war engagement in Third World countries will pose more threat to global peace. The refugee crisis in Europe was a pointer to the fact that the world is a global system and so, the consequences of poverty and conflicts in Third World countries could easily be exported to any part of the world. Any damage done in any part of the world is a damage done in every part of the world.

References

- Akpotor, A. S. (2013). *Theoretical foundation of International Relations*. Benin City, Allen publications.
- Aljazeera. (20 Feb. 2018). *North Korea's Nuclear Weapons: What we know*. News/Asia Pacific.
- Arnold, K. (2019). *U.S Proxy Warfare: Patterns in Middle Eastern Conflicts*. Ise.ac.uk
- Associated Press (2011). *Speaker Says Russia's WTO Entry Hinges on Georgia*. Fox News. Retrieved from <http://www.foxnews.com/us/2011/10/25/speaker-says-russias-wto-entry-hinges-on-georgia/>
- Beinart, P. (2008). Balancing Act: The Other Wilsonianism. *World Affairs*, 171(1), 76-88. <https://doi.org/10.3200/WAFS.171.1.76-88>
- Birtle, A. J. (2000). *The Korean War: Years of Stalemate* (p. 34). U.S. Army Center of Military History.
- Bremer, I. (May 28, 2015). *These Are the 5 Reasons Why the U.S. Remains the World's Only Superpower Time*.
- Bremmer, I. (2015). *Portfolio*. New York (Penguin Group).
- Collins, L., & Lapierre, D. (1973). O Jerusalem. In *Pan Books*.
- Conrad, J. (2011). Interstate rivalry and terrorism: An unprobed Link. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 55(4), 529-555. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002710393916>
- El-Nawawy, M. (2002). *The Israel Egyptian Peace Process in the reporting of Western Journalist*. Ablex/Greenwood.
- English.news.cn. (19 February 2015). *Afghanistan sees record high of civilians' casualties in five years*.
- Eze, R. C. (2015). An appraisal of awareness mutually oriented strategy against anti-terrorism. *Global Journal of Management and Social Sciences (GOJAMSS)*, 9, 67-74
- Eze, R. C., & Ebie, S. O. (2017). Causes and effects of escalating Europe refugee crisis. *Journal of Policy and Development Studies*, 11(3). <https://doi.org/10.12816/0040644>
- Fox, W. (1944). *The Super-powers: The United States, Britain, and the Soviet Union—Their responsibility for peace*. Harcourt, Brace a. Co.
- Hall, H. D. (1944). *The Super Powers: The United States, Britain and the Soviet Union—Their responsibility for peace*. By William T.R. foxnew York: Harcourt, brace and company. *American*

- Political Science Review*, 38(5), 1013-1015. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1949612>
- Hondrox, J. (1983). *Occupation and Resistance: The Greek Agony, 1941-1944*. Pella Publishing Company.
- Hughes, G. (2014). My Enemy's Enemy: Proxy Warfare in International Politics (pp. 12-13). Brighton: Sussex Academic Press.
- Hughes, G. (2014). My Enemy's Enemy: Proxy Warfare in International Politics (pp. 12-13). Brighton: Sussex Academic Press.
- Jones, H. (1989). A New kind of War. *America's Global Strategy and the Truman Doctrine in Greece*.
- Kolko, G. (1985). Anatomy of a War: Vietnam, the United States and the modern historical experience. In *Pantheon book*.
- Masters, J., & Zachary, L. (2014). *Hezbollah (a.k.a. Hizbollah, Hizbu'llah)*. Council on Foreign Relations.Web.
- Michael, O. H. (2015). Superpowers showdown or opportunity? *The National Interest Magazine*.
- Minter, W. (2008). *Apartheid's Contras: An Inquiry into the Roots of War in Angola and Mozambique* (Book Surge, p. 172).
- Mumford, A. (2013). Proxy warfare and the future of conflict. *The RUSI Journal*, 158(2), 40-46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03071847.2013.787733>
- Norris, R. S. (2012). *The Cuban Missile Crisis: A Nuclear Order of Battle October/November 1962* (PDF). Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0096340212464364>
- Osmańczyk, J. E. (2002). *Encyclopedia of the United Nations and International Agreements* (p. 1869). Abingdon: Routledge Books.
- Osmańczyk, J. E. (2002). *The Encyclopedia of the United Nations and International Agreements* (p. 1869). Abingdon: Routledge Books.
- Robert, F. (1984). Did Britain start the Cold War? Bevin and the Truman Doctrine. *Historical Journal*, 27(3), 715-727. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X00018045>
- SATP. (2015). *Fatalities in Terrorist Violence in Pakistan 2003-2015*. SATP Web.
- Schwerninger, S. (2003). *The Multi polar World Vs. The Superpower: The Globalist*.
- The Guardian. (24 November 2002). *Full text: Bin Laden's letter to America*.
- United States Department of State. (2015). *The Korean War, 1950-1953*. U.S. Department of State Office of the Historian, Office of the Historian, Bureau of Public Affairs, United States Department of State.
- Von Drehle, D. (2006). The Multipolar Unilateralist. In *The Washington Post*.
- Wilde, R. (2015). *Mutually Assured Destruction: About Education*.
- World Peace Meditation. (2017). *The broadcasting effect of brainwave coherence Devotional Services Dates and Times*. Mount Ecclesia, CA, USA.